

saying the same thing in different ways and that neither side should be accorded more credibility than the other.

I hope that the President begins to reduce his rhetoric against the Republicans who want the same thing he does, and I hope that the Republicans will understand that a tax cut that is offered by the President is not out of consideration altogether. Someplace we should have both a tax cut and Medicare reform.

One final point, Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge here and now that we Republicans have failed the public-relations war to make clear to the American people why we seek a balanced budget, because every time we say we want this cold steel unattractive item called the balanced budget, we are met by the opposition who say, "What are you doing to the children, the orphans, to the disabled," and all of that. They win that battle, but the balanced budget that we seek will bring an era of prosperity in which all the needs of the American people will be met, and the balanced budget that the Republicans seek here and to which the President has agreed over 7 years will reduce the chaos that we have in this country and all the segments of the society.

BASING THE BUDGET ON ITS MERITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to comment on the events concerning the budget and the controversy that has engulfed the Congress and the Nation concerning it.

First and foremost I must say that I think that the contributions, the focus this year and the focus in the past campaign, which was largely due to efforts in 1994 on the part of the Clinton, the Bush, and the Perot factors to focus on a balanced budget, was a good focus for our Nation. I think that that is a desirable goal. In fact I think that in 2 years in the programs that were passed have actually moved us in that direction, probably not as dramatically as some would want, but they have moved us in that direction. But I think that it is very important, as we move toward trying to resolve the budget deficits on an annual basis, and in the long range we hopefully can get there, and I hope and I think that that is possible, I think we have to look also at the fact of what happens in terms of the balance of the programs that we have. Achieving a balance in terms of no annual deficits is important, but we also have to recognize that there is a human deficit that could develop and that is developing in our Nation today as we look at the disparities in incomes and wages that people earn and the unwillingness today in this Congress, largely by the majority party, the Republican majority, my friends, that they are not willing to move on the

minimum wage. I think that we ought to do that, try to address that. More importantly, I think we ought to be working to empower workers and to give them the skills, and the education and the ability in training and skills they need, as I said, so that they can be more productive workers, so that they can earn better wages.

But, Mr. Speaker, as we look at the events that have happened here, the controversy that is going on with regards to plans and schemes to try and achieve a balanced budget, I would just want to remind my colleagues that, having served here through the 1980's, this is not the first plan that we have had with good intentions to balance the budget, no, not at all. In fact I think, as has been mentioned on the floor by both Republicans and Democrats, both President Bush and President Reagan had sought and, of course, pledged their fidelity to a balanced budget, that they were going to attain it sometime in the future. In spite of the fact that that was the goal, and I think many in Congress, some in Congress, with regards to the Gramm-Rudman I, Gramm-Rudman II, they all had plans to achieve a balanced budget. So I think that they had 4-year plans, 5-year plans, but the fact is that what happened is that events in the economy overtook those plans. I think sometimes they were premised on unrealistic tax and unrealistic policy and program changes that did not achieve that, but, too, notwithstanding that, the other major factors, I think, are some of the unforeseen things that happened in the economy.

I note that one of the—throughout this week one of the accomplishments, or goals, or the basis for the balanced budget and the achievement of it is the suggestion that somehow interest rates are going to go down, that that is going to be a big accomplishment. Well, I would suggest modestly to my friends that the Congress of this country does not completely control the economy. We do have a free economy and a global basis. We do not control that economy, nor should we. I do not think that we should. I think we can have an impact on it. Whether it is going to be as dramatic and positive as what my colleagues believe I would very much question. So I think that most of us that have served in this body understand that we are going to have to address this issue of trying to achieve a balance each year. Each year we are going to have to take incremental steps.

Having a plan; well, that is very good. Trying to do this within a certain period of time, 4 years, 5 years, 7 years I think is probably more realistic than trying to do it all at once where we would cause a catastrophic impact on our economy in terms of its performance. But I must say that while we strongly disagree, I strongly disagree with many of the elements that have been put into the reconciliation bill, which is this year's, this 7-year pro-

gram to in fact try to achieve a balance, because I think while it might indeed balance the budget at the end of that given the—if the economic predictions were to hold out, which I think would not hold out, not because of any bad faith, but simply because of the nature of our economy; but I think the programs inherent in that, that make the cuts, that make the changes, are inherently, are inherently unfair.

I think the premise of a balanced budget that is going to work, the programs that are going to work, is going to have to be shared sacrifice. When you start out with half of the reductions taking place in Medicare and Medicaid, and start out with putting in a large tax cut, distributed in an unusual way to those that have higher incomes, I think you start out with a bad premise.

Now the fact is that—the fact is with regard to that type of budget—it simply is not going to do it, it is not fair, it is not going to get the support of the President, and it should not receive the support of the President.

So I would hope that this week we—if you cannot solve it on the merits, I think it is wrong to try to push this down the throats of the American people based in terms of the annual appropriations bills. You have to sell it on the merits. It has failed on the merits, so now we are trying something different, and that is trying to cut off the appropriations in November, and again now in December and through the new year.

So I would hope my colleagues would consider that and consider my words in terms of the decisions they make in the weeks ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

COMMENTARY ON BOOKS AND MOVIES IS IMPORTANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, before I get into my subject, let me just comment briefly on what my colleague just stated in respect to the balanced-budget negotiations. He mentioned, the last thing he mentioned, were the tax cuts, and you know I have looked at the tax cuts, the \$500-per-child tax credits, and I do not think that is a strange tax cut, and that is, by far, the biggest amount of money that is manifest in the Republican package. That says that you get \$500 credit per child.

Now that means, if you are a person who is a working person who only pays today \$1,500 in tax liability, you have three children, at \$500 apiece your tax